

State of Nevada IT Project Oversight Committee

Agenda & Meeting Minutes

Meeting Name: ITPOC
Facilitator: Roberta Roth
Recorder: Kathy Ryan
Date: December 4, 2003
Time: 1:30 PM
Location: State Library Board Room

Attendees

Members	Attend ✓	Guests
Roberta Roth, UCCSN	✓	John Stewart – DoIT
Kathy Ryan, DoIT	✓	Angela Grato – DoIT
Terry Savage, DoIT		Del Byassee – DoIT
Robert Chisel, NDOT		Chuck Chinnock - Taxation
Dave McTeer, IFS	✓	Tom Summers - Taxation
Kathy Shabi, DETR	✓	Ann Conlin - Taxation
Brian Kagele, SOS		Stan Gille - Taxation
Kathy Comba, DPS	✓	
Chuck Moltz, AG	✓	
Kim Munoz, SOS	✓	

Minutes –

The minutes from the 11/6/03 meeting were reviewed and approved.

Agenda Items and Discussion

1.	<p>Discussion of DoIT Mainframe Upgrade project:</p> <p>John Stewart gave the committee an update. The project plan has been revised to reflect the additional time allocated for the user test plan and user acceptance. John assured the committee that the existing environment will not change until everything works.</p> <p>Angela Grato distributed the revised project plan and the mainframe migration strategy document. She reviewed the document with the committee.</p> <p>Dave McTeer asked about the risk of migrating the CSP applications for NOMADS. John advised that he had received a verbal assurance from IBM that it would work on the new platform. There is no formal guarantee since this product is no longer supported by IBM.</p> <p>Roberta asked if there is a replacement for CSP. John advised there is, Visual Age. The</p>
----	---

	<p>Welfare division has been considering migrating off CSP to Visual Age since 2001 but it has been a resource problem for them. If CSP does not work on the new mainframe Welfare will have to migrate NOMADS to Visual Age and it could take 3 months.</p> <p>Roberta asked if that occurred would they keep the R36 and R45 running and John advised that they would. They would have to pay to keep both systems running until the NOMADS could be migrated off the old system.</p> <p>Kathy Shabi asked about ADABAS and John advised that was at the shell level, whereas CSP is an embedded level.</p> <p>The plan is to migrate NOMADS first and then the DETR ADABAS applications, then all the other users. John will be meeting with all 35 users and asking them 6 key questions to help them gauge their readiness for the migration and develop agency work plans. A TIGER team will be assembled to help agencies as needed.</p> <p>The committee thanked John and Angela for presenting the migration strategy.</p>
2.	<p>Review of the Monthly Child Nutrition Project IPR & Deliverables:</p> <p>Angela Grato gave an update on the Child Nutrition Project and the funding issues. For Phase I, the project team is re-scoping the project and is negotiating with the vendor. The vendor will not convert any claims data or do the Cultural Change management. The vendor has offered to reduce their contract amount by the \$69,000 funding shortfall if the warranty period is reduced. The project team is considering this option.</p> <p>The committee complimented Angela and the Education project team on their creative negotiations and potential solutions to the funding shortfall for Phase I.</p> <p>The committee asked Angela about the environment at Education for the project's computer equipment. There was concern expressed about the physical environment and security. Angela said she would look into it and report back to the committee.</p> <p>For Phase II, Education is pursuing the additional funding needed.</p>
3.	<p>Review of monthly Wildlife Licensing CSPEC:</p> <p>Kathy R. reported that a response was received from the Wildlife project manager on the changes in deliverable dates as a result of the 3rd contract amendment. The project manager was able to clarify the change in the dates. The committee appreciated the explanation.</p> <p>The description of the "wring out" process was also received. The committee discussed this process and had a different point of view. Roberta will contact the project manager and explain why this "wring out" process is not a state standard.</p>
4.	<p>Review of the Monthly MMIS-DSS IPR & Deliverables:</p> <p>The committee reviewed the monthly IPR and deliverables schedule and had a few questions.</p>

	<p>Clarification is needed on the January dates shown. Kathy Comba expressed concern that some deliverables were still open and appeared overdue. If a deliverable is unacceptable to the state the schedule needs to show that, otherwise it is unclear what the issue is.</p> <p>Roberta will follow up with the project manager.</p>
5.	<p>Review of the MHDS AIMS to Avatar replacement project IPR & Project Plan:</p> <p>The committee reviewed the monthly IPR and project plan and did not have any questions or concerns.</p>
6.	<p>Review of the DCFS AIMS to Avatar replacement project IPR & Deliverables schedule:</p> <p>The committee reviewed the monthly IPR. The Contract was signed on 11/5/03 and it is just getting started. Dave McTeer reported that it is a COTS with little to no modifications.</p>
7.	<p>Review of the monthly DETR Contributions Redesign CSPEC:</p> <p>The committee reviewed the monthly CSPEC and did not have any questions or concerns. Kathy S. advised that the project needed a permanent project manager and they would be filling that position shortly.</p>
8.	<p>Review of the monthly DETR Raison CSPEC and quarterly risk management report:</p> <p>Kathy S. reported that the project is going well and on track. The committee reviewed the monthly CSPEC and did not have any questions or concerns.</p>
9.	<p>Review of the monthly Tax MBT IPR:</p> <p>The Tax project team, led by the Director of Taxation, Chuck Chinnock, gave a presentation on the Modified Business Tax (MBT) project.</p> <p>The modified business tax was passed by the legislature this past session and became effective 10/01/03. The tax department must send the returns out by January 1st and be able to collect the taxes which are due 1/31/04.</p> <p>The MBT project has three phases. The target date for Phase 1 is 1/1/04, the other two phases are targeted for completion in August 04.</p> <p>It is intended for the MBT system to be used only 5 quarters, then the comprehensive Unified Tax system (UTS) will replace it.</p> <p>Roberta asked about the interface with the Employment Securities division (ESD) data, was it a one time integration? Chuck replied they would receive monthly updates from ESD.</p> <p>Roberta also asked if they had Development, Test and Production environments established for the project and Stan Gillie advised yes, they did.</p>

	<p>Since the MBT project was so critical to the state and had such a short time frame to be implemented the committee had asked the Tax project team to prepare a contingency plan. Chuck distributed the plan and walked the committee through it. The plan contained a business risk assessment for each business function which determined the criticality of availability of each business function by 1/1/04. For those functions with a medium or high risk, the impact was defined and a work around identified. The Tax project team advised the committee they intended to monitor these medium to high risk functions very closely. They also told the committee that by preparing the assessment and the contingency plan it helped them to identify potential problem areas and which areas they would need to watch closely.</p>
--	---

Action Items¹

Item No.	Date Opened	Description	Assigned To	Status	Date Closed
25.	6/6/2002	Review the Kansas Project Management guide and modify as needed	On Hold	On Hold	
26.	6/6/2002	Develop the Nevada Project Management training and certification program	On Hold	On Hold	
39.	7/10/03	Contact Wildlife and request clarification on the “Wring Out” process.	Kathy R.	Emailed 8/4/03 & 10/30/03	12/4/03
42.	8/7/03	The committee requested the CNP project manager document the contingency plan for Phase 2 in the event sufficient funding is not obtained.	Angela Grato	Sched for Nov ITPOC mtg	12/4/03
44.	9/11/03	Develop a template and guide for contingency plans. Update affected PSPs.	All		
45.	10/2/03	Contact Wildlife and request clarification on changes in deliverable dates as a result of the 3 rd contract amendment.	Kathy R	Emailed 10/30/03	12/4/03
46.	10/2/03	Revisit the weighting criteria used for the Risk Assessment. Some items automatically should make a project high-risk.	All		
47.	12/4/03	Contact Wildlife and advise them of the ITPOC’s view on the “Wring Out” process.	Roberta		
48.	12/4/03	Contact the MMIS project manager for clarification on some of the deliverable dates	Roberta		

Decisions²

¹ *Action Item*: A commitment to complete an action or an assignment.

² *Decision*: Reaching a conclusion... particularly in response to a course of action.

Item No.	Decision	Date

Approved By

Signature	Name	Role	Date